

REMARKS

Pursuant to the final Office Action for the above-identified case mailed April 4, 2004, Applicants submit this Amendment. In this case, Claims 1 to 32 were pending previously. Claims 1, and 12 are being amended herein. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments. It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this Amendment, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any fees owed.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 12 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,809,254 to Edsall ("*Edsall*"). Claims 2 to 11 and 19 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of *Edsall* and the disclosure in the Background of the application ("Background"). Claims 23 to 32 have been allowed.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicants have taken under advisement the Patent Office's objection to the process language, "after insertion." Claim 1 has been clarified to place the language in structural terms, namely, that at least one of the elements and indicators is "configured and arranged" to be electrically connected after insertion to at least one conductive end of the housing. Further, Claim 1 as presently presented identifies that the conductive end is exposed and configured to be connected removably with a mating connector.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Edsall* does not teach or suggest Claim 1 as presently presented. The *Edsall* device is different from Claim 1 in a number of respects. The *Edsall* device, for example, is different because it includes separate housings for the short circuit element and the current overload element. Claim 1 highlights that structural difference, namely, that the elements and indicators are coupled together as a unit that is inserted into a protective housing. Claim 1 also specifies that one of the end caps is configured and arranged to be connected electrically to the elements and indicators after the elements and indicators are placed inside the body.

The above-claimed blown fuse indicator is not taught or suggested by *Edsall*, which in Fig. 6 of that reference discloses indicators 40 and 41 that are separate from one another. Indeed, indicators 40 and 41 are disposed outside of the current limiting device A and overload device B, which represent schematically like devices illustrated in Figs. 1 and

4 of *Edsall*. Because devices A and B of *Edsall* are intended to be separate and replaceable with respect to one another, the elements and indicators of *Edsall* are not capable of being inserted together either into the housing of element A or the housing of element B.

As seen in Fig. 6 and the corresponding disclosure of *Edsall*, devices A and B are crimped to conductive ends 44 and 47 of cables 45 and 48, respectively, of *Edsall*. Conductive ends 44 and 47 would appear to be the analogous structures to the end caps of Claim 1. Because sleeve 49 has narrow axially outer portions at 50 and 51 of “relatively small cross-sectional area” (col. 5, lines 52, 53) that “fit fairly tightly or snugly upon cables 45 and 48, respectively” (col. 5, line 51), it would appear that devices A and B are both crimped to conductive cables 45 and 48 prior to being enclosed within sleeve 49, which encapsulates such conductive ends. That is, none of devices A and B and indicators 40 and 41 of *Edsall* appear to be “configured and arranged” so as to be connected electrically to at least one end of the “end caps” 44 and 47 after being inserted into sleeve 49.

Furthermore, Claim 1 as presently presented identifies that the conductive end is exposed and configured to be connected removably from a mating connector. *Edsall* does not teach or suggest such structure. For at least the above-described reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 and Claims 2 to 11 that depend therefrom are each structurally different, patentably distinct and allowable over *Edsall*.

Applicants incorporate each of the arguments in any previous response made in opposition to the obviousness rejection of dependent Claims 3 to 11. Applicants again respectfully submit that Claims 3 to 11 provide additional patentable distinctions over *Edsall* and the Background.

Regarding Claim 12, Applicants respectfully disagree with certain findings made in the Office Action. First, housing 1', 17' (Fig. 5 of *Edsall*) is used to teach the housing of Claim 12 (Office Action at page 4, top). Housing 1', 17' does not receive at least portions of the indicators A and B (introduced in Fig. 5 of *Edsall*) as called for in Claim 12. Housing 1', 17' does not therefore meet the claim.

Fig. 6 does not appear to depict that indicator 14 is inserted into tubular housing through an end of the housing as stated in the Office Action. Fig. 6 does not even show

element 14. Moreover, element 14 is not an indicator, it is a heating rod (*Edsall* at column 3, line 18). If indicator 41 is meant instead, then that interpretation does not meet the claim because it is not taught to be inserted into housing 1', 17' as called for in Claim 12. Furthermore, if housing 1', 17' is taken to be the housing of Claim 12, the teaching fails because the alleged conductive ends 44, 47 are neither (i) exposed nor (ii) configured to be connected electrically and removably with a mating connector as stated in the claim as presently presented.


If sleeve 49 is instead taken instead as the housing of Claim 12, it does not appear that sleeve 49 has an open end large enough to receive the elements A and B of *Edsall* as called for by Claim 12. Further, sleeve 49 does not appear to receive conductive ends. Nor, therefore does sleeve 49 show, teach or suggest conductive ends that are (i) exposed and (ii) configured to be connected electrically and removably with a mating connector as seen in Claim 12 as presently presented. Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that Claim 12 and Claims 13 to 22 that depend from Claim 12 are patentably distinct over *Edsall*.

It should be appreciated that the patentability of Claims 1 and 12 renders moot the separate obviousness rejections of Claims 2 to 11 and 19 to 22.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney designated below. Applicants note that the timely filing of this Amendment affords Applicants the benefits under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Robert W. Connors
Reg. No. 46,639
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4214

Dated: June 14, 2004